

REMARKS

Claims 14, 16, 17, 28, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Johnson et al., US 6,373,188. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claim 14 as amended recites “a semiconductor light emitting diode having a top surface and a bottom surface, the top surface comprising a light-emitting surface.” Electrical connectors are formed on the bottom surface of the semiconductor light emitting diode. A plurality of regions of phosphor provided on the light-emitting surface, which is on the top surface. In contrast, Fig. 1 of Johnson et al. clearly illustrates that ohmic contacts 38 and 50 and phosphor coating 30 are all formed on the *same* surface, that is, the *top* surface of the light emitting diode. Johnson et al. does not show phosphor on the top surface and electrical connectors on the bottom surface. Johnson et al. fails to teach every element of claim 14, thus claim 14 is allowable over Johnson et al. Claims 16, 17, 28, and 30-32 depend from claim 14 and are therefore allowable over Johnson et al. for at least the same reason as claim 14.

Claims 14, 16, 17, 28, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vriens et al., US 4,822,144. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. As described above, claim 14 recites a semiconductor light emitting diode with a top surface and a bottom surface. Electrical connectors are formed on the bottom surface. A plurality of regions of phosphor are provided on a light-emitting surface on the top surface. Applicants have found no such teaching in Vriens et al. RGB luminescent material regions 8 and electrodes 5, 6 are both formed on the same side of radiation source 10. Vriens et al. fails to teach every element of claim 14, thus claim 14 is allowable over Vriens et al. Claims 16, 17, 28, and 30-32 depend from claim 14 and are therefore allowable over Vriens et al. for at least the same reason as claim 14.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. in view of Duggal et al., US 6,294,800, and over Vriens et al. in view of Duggal et al. Duggal

et al. adds nothing to the deficiencies of Johnson et al. or Vriens et al. with respect to claim 14. Claim 29 depends from claim 14 and is therefore allowable over either Johnson et al. or Vriens et al. in combination with Duggal et al. for at least the same reasons claim 14 is allowable over Johnson et al. and Vriens et al.

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 382-0480.

Respectfully submitted,

/Rachel V. Leiterman/

Rachel V. Leiterman
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 46,868